



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/642,868	11/01/2000	Laddie L. James	9066.002	8108

7590 07/01/2002

William David Kiesel  
PO Box 15928  
Baton Rouge, LA 70895

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DINH Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3752

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/642,868

Applicant(s)

JAMES, LADDIE L.

Examiner

Dinh Q Nguyen

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 17 April 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herzog in view of Kirchner et al.

Herzog discloses a spraying device 10 mountable on a truck 12 comprising:

an engine 24 having an exhaust pipe 26;

a storage tank 14 under pressure during operation;

a first line 60 for connecting the exhaust pipe 26 to the storage tank 14 and serving as a source of pressure;

a second line 71 for connecting the storage tank 14 to a nozzle 91; and

a pressure relief valve 43;

and operating pressures of up to 35 PSI.

However, Herzog discloses a pressurization system for pressurizing a liquid holding tank on a truck for spraying water onto road surfaces (column 1, lines 7-12), but fails to disclose a tack material for spraying. Kirchner discloses a tack spraying apparatus 10 for mounting on a tanker trailer 12 for spraying pressurized tack material onto road surfaces. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Herzog with a tack material for spraying as suggested by Kirchner, since there is no preclusion on the system preventing it from

Art Unit: 3752

spray tack material, and it would be provide an alternative manner for distributing bituminous products to road surfaces (column 1, line 11).

With respect to claims 7-10, 19 and 21, both Herzog and Kirchner have orifice diameters but no specifics are provided. Note that Kirchner is specifically sized for tack material. Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have had the nozzle orifices have nominal diameter for spraying tack material, since such sizes would need to be optimized to provide the optimum results for the particular material being sprayed.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed April 17, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the Herzog '543 reference, it is specifically mentioned in column 1, lines 7-12 that the invention relates to a pressurization system for pressurizing a liquid holding tank with specifically to a watering truck for spraying water to road surfaces. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the Herzog's pressurization system for the purpose of pressurizing any types of liquid in a holding tank. With respect to claims 7-10, 19 and 21, although no specific mention of a nominal orifice diameter greater than any polymer ball in the Herzog in view of Kirchner references, it is inherent that an ordinary skill in the art would pick an orifice with a diameter large enough to maintain a nozzle discharge of a highly viscous material without any interruption that due to the clogging of the nozzle.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 3752

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinh Q Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0248. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Yuen can be reached on (703) 308-1946. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7766 for regular communications and (703) 746-4591 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.



Lesley D. Morris  
Primary Examiner

AL 3752

dqn  
June 27, 2002